

Dear Jeff,

2/25/79

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to the editor of Outlook rather than a letter-to-the-editor for publication. I intend this as more than a courtesy. I express my disappointment over your personal irresponsibility in what for all practical purposes is indisputable from spook disinformation.

The letter is an under statement in many ways. I am aghast that you would present Blakey by the long ending quotation as other than his record in running- dominating- the committee leaves without doubt. He is a practising anti-civil libertarian, a practising authoritarian, and in his ripoff of an approach that is responsible he presents himself and the committee falsely. They are merely the newest of the basic institutions of society to fail the people and the system. Failure hardly describes their record.

Oglesby has a long record of not letting fact or truth interfere with the silly theories he dreams up and then wills into actuality. But of you I'd expected better.

Why you did not bother to check the few so-called facts in this nightmare I do not know but you should have because your factual inaccuracy is total.

If you would care to provide a written explanation of how what you and others criticize in the Commission, the FBI, the CIA and others becomes right for you people personally and the AIB and others like it in general I will be glad to include it in my files for archival deposit.

You might want to include how all that is wrong for all that went ahead becomes right for the abortion in which you share responsibility.

How is the committee better with Baden and Humes than the Commission was with Humes and many others.

How was it wrong for the Commission not to take Burkley's testimony and right for the committee to duplicate that offense?

How does it become honorable and decent and right and proper for the committee to limit Guinn's examinations to exclude copper and wrong for the Commission not to disclose any results of the same tests? Or for the FBI to hide them?

If you believe that in these non-rhetorical questions I am not addressing the honesty and intent of the piece in the Post I would again welcome a written explanation to accompany my letter to Greider and this to you.

On a personal level, I repeat, I am very disappointed in you. I expected no better from the Yanker of the Cowboys.

When you speak to Katz please thank him for the suggestion he made to me at Boston U. I was interrupted by questions before I finished speaking and because the audience was so small decided to continue with taking and answering questions. Bob suggested that for an uninformed audience there was an insufficient basis. I rearranged the cards from which I speak to have the basic crime facts at the very beginning and believe it is much more effective even when I am not interrupted. I tried it last week.

Sincerely,